

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application as amended is respectfully requested. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-7 and 17-29 are currently pending.

Claims 1-7 and 17-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,158,341. In the Response to Arguments portion of the Office Action, it is asserted that Figure 7 of Holmberg discloses the step of "printing in a first direction along the bottom surface of the piece 4." It is further asserted that from Figure 7 of Holmberg it can be seen that "the convex side of the tamp pad becomes compressed causing printing in the first direction along the bottom surface of piece 4." Figure 7 of Holmberg illustrates a cross-section of a printing pad in a mode of printing of a mobile phone casing.

Independent claim 1 as amended is directed to "a method of tamp printing using at least one tamp pad having at least a convex side and a concave side on a piece having a plurality of boundary surfaces forming angles in relation to one another" including the steps of "compressing the at least one tamp pad against a first boundary surface"; "causing the convex side of the at least one tamp pad to deform by the compression, the deformation of the convex side causing printing of at least one picture in a first direction against the first boundary surface of the plurality of boundary surfaces"; and "causing at least a portion of the concave side of the at least one tamp pad to deform by the compression into a non-concave shape, and printing therefrom of at least one picture in a second direction against a second boundary surface of the plurality of boundary surfaces." Support for the amendment to independent claim 1 can be found at at least page 6, line 25 to page 8, line 2. Applicant respectfully submits that Holmberg fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 as amended.

In particular, Applicant respectfully submits and further supports by affidavit that the Holmberg teachings do not teach or suggest these features as now specifically claimed. For example, and as supported by affidavit, Holmberg fails to teach or suggest the significant feature of independent claim 1: "causing at least a portion of the concave side of the at least one tamp pad to deform by the compression into a non-concave shape, and printing therefrom of at least one picture in a second direction against a second boundary surface of the plurality of boundary surfaces." The printing by the printing pad 5 onto the detail 4 described by Holmberg is caused only by the concave side of the printing pad 5 not by "causing at least a portion of the concave side of the at least one tamp pad to deform by the compression into a non-concave shape, and printing therefrom of at least one picture in a second direction against a second boundary surface of the plurality of boundary surfaces" as now specifically claimed. For example, as illustrated in Figure 10 of Holmberg, printing by the printing pad 5 on the detail 4 is caused only by the convex side of the printing pad 5, not by deformation by compression of a concave side into a non-concave shape to cause printing of at least one picture in a second direction against a second boundary surface of the detail 4.

The above referenced further support is provided by an enclosed 37 C.F.R. 1.132 Affidavit and Declaration executed by Per Holmberg, the sole inventor of Holmberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,341) and a joint inventor of the present application. In the 37 C.F.R. 1.132 Affidavit and Declaration, it is submitted by Per Holmberg that "the printing by the printing pad 5 onto the detail 4 described in Holmberg is caused only by a convex side of the printing pad 5, not by 'causing at least a portion of the concave side of the at least one tamp pad to deform by the



compression into a non-concave shape, and printing therefrom of at least one picture in a second direction against a second boundary surface of the plurality of boundary surfaces' as found in independent claim 1." Per Holmberg further submits in the Affidavit and Declaration that "this is a distinct difference that is neither taught, described, nor suggested by Holmberg."

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 distinguishes over Holmberg and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of independent claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 2-7 and 17-29 are dependent upon and include the features of independent claim 1. For at least the reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-7 and 17-29 also distinguish over Holmberg and requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 2-7 and 17-29 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael W. Maddox
Michael W. Maddox

Registration No.: 47,764

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant